



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/280,152	03/26/1999	WILLIAM D. GENTRY	SN0197CIP	5366

7590 09/10/2002

STEVEN B. PHILLIPS
NORTEL PATENT DEPARTMENT
P O BOX 13828
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 277093828

EXAMINER

HARPER, KEVIN C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2664

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/280,152

Applicant(s)

GENTRY ET AL

Examiner

Kevin C. Harper

Art Unit

2664

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: page 8, lines 23-25, reference number 50; and, page 8, line 25, reference number 60.
2. The drawings are objected to because Figure 1, "DGW" should be --EOGW-- as noted on page 9, line 1 of the Specification.
3. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 2 is objected to because "a an" in line 8 should be --an--. Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Art Unit: 2664

5. Claims 1-51 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-51 of copending Application No. 09/218,808. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-7, 13-19, 21-27, 33-39 and 45-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu et al. (US 5,953,651) in view of Lee et al. (US 6,161,008).

6. Regarding claims 1, 13, 21, 33 and 45-46, Lu discloses a method of providing end office wireline telephony services to wireless subscribers (Figure 1; abstract, lines 1-4). The mobility services are managed for a wireless call (abstract, lines 13-16). However, Lu does not disclose that the services are provided using a packet network. Lee discloses an IP network for

Art Unit: 2664

connecting cellular users to an end office (Figure 1; abstract, lines 1-7). The wireless telephony protocol is mapped to a data packet network protocol (Figure 1, item 114) and the end office protocol is mapped to a data packet network protocol (item 110). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have a packet network in the invention of Lu as evidenced by Lee in order to simplify the connectivity and extend the range of connectivity between the disparate networks (Lee, col. 3, line 53 through col. 4, line 9).

7. Regarding claims 2-7, 14-19, 22-27 and 34-39, Lu in view of Lee discloses a wireless to wireline or wireline to wireless call (Lu, Figures 4 and 8; col. 10, lines 40-55 and col. 15, lines 4-9) using a data packet network (Lee, Figure 1).

8. Regarding claims 47-51, Lu in view of Lee does not disclose using the various claimed protocols. One skilled in the art would recognize that any appropriate standardized protocol may be used in a network depending on desired network operating characteristics. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use an ATM protocol, an IS-634 wireless protocol, an H.323 protocol, a Session Initiation Protocol, or a Multi-Gateway Control Protocol (or Media Gateway Control Protocol) in the invention of Lu in view of Lee as a matter of design choice.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 8-12, 20, 28-32 and 40-44 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2664

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bojeryd (US 5,771,381) discloses a mobility adjunct for a PSTN. Freeburg et al. (US 5,940,381) discloses a base station network using ATM connectivity between wireless network elements.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Harper whose telephone number is 703-305-0139. The examiner can normally be reached weekdays, except Wednesday, from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin, can be reached at 703-305-4366. The fax number for Technology Center (TC) 2600 is 703-872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service Office for TC 2600 at 703-306-0377.

Kevin C. Harper



September 9, 2002

KWANG BIN YAO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

